



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/164,777 10/01/98 MULLOR

M REINC4237.01

EXAMINER

TM02/1220

SPENCER AND FRANK
SUITE 300 EAST
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3955

HEWITT, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED:

12/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/164,777

Applicant(s)

MULLOR ET AL.

Examiner

Calvin L Hewitt II

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 2.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1-15 have been examined.

Response to Applicants' Request

2. Applicant's desire for clarity regarding the Examiner's Office Action dated October 18, 2000 has been noted. In response, the Examiner has written another Office Action that the Examiner believes speaks directly to the issues raised by the Applicants.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Ginter et al U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900.

As per claim 1, Ginter et al teach of a system and method for secure transactions management and electronic rights protection that:

- restricts software operation within a license limitation (column 5, lines 29-41; column 6, lines 29-65; column 7, lines 45-57)
- utilizes a computer that has a first non-volatile memory area (column 70, lines 40-65), a second non-volatile memory area (column 70, lines 40-65) and a volatile memory area (column 71, lines 12-25)
- provides a means of selecting a program residing in the volatile memory (column 71, lines 25-27 and column 82, lines 12-52)
- sets up a verification structure in the non-volatile memories (column 70, lines 23-53 and column/line 63/67-64/15)
- verifies the program using the structure (column 70, lines 23-53 and column/line 63/67-64/15)
- and acts on the program according to the verification (column 70, lines 23-53 and column/line 63/67-64/15).

As per claim 2, the method and system of Ginter et al provide for a license authorization bureau in the form of a VDE (virtual distribution environment) distributor and/or administrator (column/line 278/40 to 281/44).

As per claim 3, the method and system of Ginter et al discloses a verification method with a license authorization bureau that comprises of:

Art Unit: 2161

- a two-way data communication link between said bureau and end-user computer (figure 77)
- a method for establishing end-user rights (column/line 278/40 to 281/44)
- data encryption using keys (column 281, lines 10-22)
- creating a license record from the selected program at the bureau (column 71, lines 25-27, column 82, lines 12-52, column/line 278/40 to 281/44 and column 15, lines 10-34).

As per claim 4, the method and system of Ginter et al also provides a means of encrypting the license record for the selected program from the second volatile memory (column/line 65/55 to 66/47).

As per claim 6, the method and system of Ginter et al provides a means for establishing a licensed software program. Where said program contains license record data and is found in the volatile memory (column 71, lines 25-27, column 82, lines 12-52, column/line 278/40 to 281/44, column 15, lines 10-34, figure 8 and column 96, lines 37-41).

As per claim 10, the method and system of Ginter et al provide a means for restricting a program's operation with predetermined limitations if the authorization is invalid (column 279, lines 21-32).

As per claim 11, the method and system of Ginter et al provide for a ROM BIOS (figure 69G and column 70, lines 39-53).

Art Unit: 2161

As per claim 12, the method and system of Ginter et al provide for an EEPROM BIOS (figure 69G and column 70, lines 54-65).

As per claim 13, the method and system of Ginter et al provide for volatile RAM (column 71, lines 22-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900 as applied to claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 above, and further in view of Goldman et al 5,684,951.

As per claim 5, Ginter et al disclose a verification structure. In addition, Ginter et al disclose a system and method for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection utilizing encryption keys (column 206, lines 57-65).

However, Ginter et al do not disclose pseudo unique keys. Goldman et al teach of a method and system for user authorization over a multi-user computer system. In said system, a user has valid id but lacks an authorized means of access. In order to access the desired data, a user is sent a pseudo unique key (abstract, lines 19-21) that is derived from

a user id and the current IP address. By utilizing such a method a valid user can be provided access to secured data without comprising the security of the larger system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of encryption, to incorporate pseudo unique keys into the system of Ginter et al.

As per claim 7, Ginter et al teach of a method and system for electronic rights protection comprising of volatile memory, non-volatile memory, license records location and licensed software programs (column 5, lines 29-41; column 6, lines 29-65; column 15, lines 10-34; column/line 63/67-64/15; column/line 65/55-66-47; column 70, lines 23-65; column 71, lines 12-27; column 96, lines 37-41; column/line 278/40-281/44). Ginter et al also use encryption keys (column 206, lines 57-65). However, Ginter et al do not make use of pseudo unique keys in their system. Goldman et al teach of a method and system for user authorization over a multi-user computer system through the use of pseudo unique keys (abstract, lines 19-23). In said system, a user has valid id but lacks an authorized means of access. In order to access the desired data, a user is sent a pseudo unique key that is derived from a user id and the current IP address. By utilizing such a method a valid user can be provided access to secured data without comprising the security of the larger system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of the time the invention was made to utilize pseudo unique keys in the system of Ginter et al.

As per claim 8, Ginter et al disclose a method for authoring content that includes encryption keys (column/line 282/ 33 to 283/34). Ginter et al disclose a method for selecting a licensed software program from the volatile memory to form a license record. However, Ginter et al do not use pseudo unique keys for purposes of encryption. Goldman et al teach of a method and system for user authorization over a multi-user computer system through the use of pseudo unique keys (abstract, lines 19-23). In said system, a user has valid id but lacks an authorized means of access. In order to access the desired data, a user is sent a pseudo unique key that is derived from a user id and the current IP address. By utilizing such a method a valid user can be provided access to secured data without comprising the security of the larger system. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use pseudo unique keys.

As per claim 9, Ginter et al teach of a system and method for encrypting and decrypting of licensing related communications between end-user(s) and a license authorization bureau (column/line 282/33 to 283/34 and 168/25 to 169/40). Ginter et al also teach of volatile and non-volatile memory areas used in conjunction with licensed software programs (columns 70-72, column 82, lines 12-52, column/line 278/40 to 281/44, column 15, lines 10-34, figure 8 and column 96, lines 37-41). However, Ginter et al do not disclose pseudo unique keys. Goldman et al provide for the use of pseudo unique keys (abstract, 19-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate pseudo unique keys into the system of Ginter et al.

6. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900 in view of Goldman et al U.S. Patent No. 5,684,951.

As per claims 14 and 15, Ginter et al. disclose a rights management system for restricting software operation (column 5, lines 29-41; column 6, lines 29-65; column 7, lines 45-57). Further, in order to execute said rights management system, Ginter et al. disclose read only memory (ROM) that may be used store encryption key information. Ginter et al. also disclose ROM components, such as masked ROM and EEPROM, that store permanent portions of code that interface with the encryption and decryption engine (column/line 70/54-71/11). Recall, Ginter et al utilize encryption keys as a method of encryption (column/line 67/48-68/16). However, Ginter et al. do not disclose pseudo unique keys. Goodman et al disclose pseudo unique keys (abstract, lines 19-23) and provides for the storage in a memory unit (column 8, lines 11-12). In said system, a user has valid id but lacks an authorized means of access. In order to access the desired data, a user is sent a pseudo unique key that is derived from a user id and the current IP address. By utilizing such a method a valid user can be provided access to secured data without comprising the security of the larger system. Therefore, it would have been obvious

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Richardson , III teaches a system for software protection

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Calvin Loyd Hewitt II whose telephone number is (703) 305-0625. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to"

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

C/o Technology Center 2700

Washington, D.C. 20231.

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 308-5397 (for informal or draft communications, please label


“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be
directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Calvin Loyd Hewitt II

December 4, 2000



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100